ENERGY SAVINGS REPORT - EXAMPLE 2



Staggs and Fisher
Consulting Engineers, Inc.

3264 Lochness Drive Lexington, Kentucky 40517 Phone 859-271-3246 Fax 859-271-3€13 E-mail info@sfengineering.com Gregory G. Carter, P.E. Daniel H. Bransom, P.E. Donald D. Durham, P.E. A. Taggart Foster, P.E. Christopher C. Keath, P.E. John R. Mason, P.E.

Member of the Consulting Engineers Council

TRANSPORTATION CABINET OFFICE BUILDING FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY ENG. FILE NO. SACB0010 JOB. NO. 00312 December 8, 2003

NARRATIVE - TRANSPORTATION CABINET OFFICE BUILDING (TCOB) OPERATING COST COMPARISON

Annual operating costs for the Transportation Cabinet Office Building – as presently designed, with energy conservation measures; were compared to the same size and type building without energy conservation measures. The energy conservation measures are projected to save over half of the total annual operating costs. The total cost for the Transportation Building with energy conservation measures was \$753,454.00 compared to \$1,802,649.00 for the building without energy conservation measures.

The most effective energy conservation measure was the use of more efficient lighting fixtures. It used to take about 4 watts per square foot to achieve the required lighting levels. Now it takes less than 2 watts per square foot to achieve the same lighting level. The 75% efficiency light ballasts previously used have now been replaced with 95% high efficiency ballasts. Using these type lights reduced the cooling load due to lighting by over 50%.

Air system fan operating costs are substantially lower. Variable volume air systems with variable frequency drives reduced the cost from those using constant volume air systems.

Several energy conservation measures to the building shell contributed to less operating costs. Insulation in the walls reduced the wall heating and cooling loads by over 66%. Insulation did not used to be used in building walls. Using clouble pane tinted glass reduced the glass heating and cooling loads by over 50%, compared to single pane clear glass.

The underfloor air distribution system reduced energy costs. Because less ductwork is required in an underfloor air system, less fan horsepower was required to move the air.

Using hot water radiant heating panels along the North exposure enabled five air handling systems to be shut down during unoccupied periods.

Pre-cooling and pre-dehumidifying the ventilation air in a separate air handling system eliminated the requirement for summer reheat in the air handling systems serving the underfloor areas.

Using increased temperature differences between hot and chilled water supply and return piping systems resulted in less required pumping horsepower.

Cc: Greg Carter (email)

File 6

P:\TRANS\OP COST

Table 1. Annual Costs

O	Conventional	TCOB
Component	(\$)	(\$)
Air System Fans	390,894	69,566
Cooling	165,363	97,286
Heating	171,197	59,201
Pumps	10,937	3,816
Cooling Tower Fans	0	0
HVAC Sub-Total	738,391	229,869
Lights	957,649	416,976
Electric Equipment	106,609	106,609
Misc. Electric	0	0
Misc. Fuel Use	0	0
Non-HVAC Sub-Total	1,064,258	523,585
Grand Total	1,802,649	753,454

Table 2. Annual Cost per Unit Floor Area

Component	Conventional (\$/ft²)	TCOB (\$/ft²)
Air System Fans	0.894	0.159
Cooling	0.378	0.223
Heating	0.392	0.135
Pumps	0.025	0.009
Cooling Tower Fans	0.000	0.000
HVAC Sub-Total	1.689	0.526
Lights	2.191	0.954
Electric Equipment	0.244	0.244
Misc. Electric	0.000	0.000
Misc. Fuel Use	0.000	0.000
Non-HVAC Sub-Total	2.435	1.198
Grand Total	4.124	1.724
Gross Floor Area (ft²)	437143.0	437143.0
Conditioned Floor Area (ft²)	437143.0	437143.0

Note: Values in this table are calculated using the Gross Floor Area.

Table 3. Component Cost as a Percentage of Total Cost

	Conventional	TCOB
Component	(%)	(%)
Air System Fans	21.7	9.2
Cooling	9.2	12.9
Heating	9.5	7.9
Pumps	0.6	0.5
Cooling Tower Fans	0.0	0.0
HVAC Sub-Total	41.0	30.5
Lights	53.1	55.3
Electric Equipment	5.9	14.1
Misc. Electric	0.0	0.0
Misc. Fuel Use	0.0	0.0
Non-HVAC Sub-Total	59.0	69.5
Grand Total	100.0	100.0